

A-NZ Peppol Stakeholder Working Group - Access Point Migration & Exit Focus Group

Meeting Summary - 7 July 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	<p>Introduction Maggie Leese welcomed everyone to the group and acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ.</p>
2	<p>Agreed principles / recommended practice Andrew Stein opened up to questions from the group on the documented agreed principles / recommended practices.</p> <p>In summary, the group discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As OpenPeppol cannot regulate BMS, the group may create draft clauses for Peppol SP and BMS contracts to support the first draft principle • Suggestion to avoid “should” in the fourth principle yet still convey that it is best practice to ensure that the end user is well informed about the decision they are making • Adding “or as soon as practical” alongside immediately in the fifth principle to support the current state and providers that may need to do this manually. Further suggestion to remove the reference to “decision to switch” from this principle
3	<p>Switching scenarios/process The group reviewed scenario 3.2 from the slide pack and discussed the role of Peppol Authorities (PA) and OpenPeppol when an SP is hostile or non responsive. Three main scenarios were identified through the discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PA needing to de-register an SP 2. End user requests to de-register and the AP is non-responsive or hostile 3. AP exits cooperatively <p><i>PA de-registering SP</i> If an SP needs to be de-registered, for example if they don't sign new Peppol Agreements, it was agreed that the PA would request OpenPeppol to remove the SP/s in question. The new agreements now put processes in place before OpenPeppol can intervene in this way including an appeals process and the right to go to the Management Committee. Where needed, OpenPeppol's emergency intervention process could be applied.</p> <p><i>End user requests to de-register and AP is non-responsive or hostile</i> Discussion on how the end user would get help in this situation and whether it's appropriate for them to be referred to their PA even though they may not know what a PA is. It was mentioned that there is an existing dispute procedure within OpenPeppol which outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If one SP has an issue with another SP, the first step should be to reach out to

	<p>the SP in question to try and resolve the issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the issue is not resolved, the next step is to reach out to the PA <p>The “worst case” scenario is the SP requesting OpenPeppol to intervene and remove SML listing.</p> <p>It was agreed that we should follow this model meaning that if an end-user requests to de-register and their SP/BMS is hostile or non-responsive, the end user can approach their new SP/BMS who will contact the existing SP to request de-registration and failing a resolution, escalate the matter to the PA. The PA should act as a neutral party to try and resolve the issue. The group was interested in documenting a further scenario where the SPs have different PAs.</p> <p>The group also noted that there is a dispute resolution process for issues between SPs and PAs.</p> <p><i>SP exits cooperatively</i></p> <p>The group discussed what happens when an SP exits cooperatively. It’s expected that APs should notify their end users about their intent to exit the market allowing them the chance to find a new SP. Where a BMS is involved, it’s expected that the BMS would switch SPs and the end user would generally not be aware. The group agreed that it is worth defining an exit process / example that reflects a smooth exit.</p> <p>It was noted that there also needs to be general information communicated out to the market and DSPs about switching.</p>
4	<p>Next steps</p> <p>The next focus group meeting will bring together the BMS and business participants. This meeting is scheduled for 14 July at 12pm AEST / 2pm AEST.</p>
5	<p>Meeting close</p>